

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 050 698

HB 002 240

TITLE Community and Junior Colleges in Perspective.
INSTITUTION Education Commission of the States, Denver, Colo.
PUB DATE Apr 71
NOTE 4p.; Report of the Task Force on Community and Junior Colleges
JOURNAL CIT Higher Education in the States; v2 n3 p33-36 Apr 1971
EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Community Colleges, *Federal Legislation, *Guidelines, *Junior Colleges, Legislation, *State Legislation

ABSTRACT

Section I of this report on community and junior colleges contains the recommended general policy statement on the following issues: (1) the need for comprehensive community colleges; (2) the development of human potential; (3) career education; (4) the need for coordination; (5) the mutuality of interests of the public and private sectors; (6) faculty preparation and development; (7) federal assistance; and (8) the Carnegie Commission's report entitled "The Open Door Colleges". Sections II and III outline the principles for federal and state action respectively, relating to community-junior colleges. (AF)

ED050698

ECS

higher education ⁱⁿ the states

published by the education commission of the states

vol. 2 no. 3

april 1971

pages 33-44

In April 1971, the final reports and recommendations of the ECS Task Force on Community and Junior Colleges and the Task Force on Statewide Planning in Higher Education were approved by the Steering Committee of the Education Commission of the States. The full texts of these reports are contained in this issue of *Higher Education in the States*. The final report of the Task Force on Vocational Education in Higher Education will be presented for approval at the Steering Committee meeting in July 1971.

In 1970 the ECS Steering Committee authorized the development of a statement of principles for consideration in drafting legislation in connection with student residency and sample model legislation incorporating these principles. These principles and model legislation are included in this issue beginning on page 41.

COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES IN PERSPECTIVE

A Report of the
TASK FORCE ON COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES

Co-Chairmen

THE HONORABLE FRANCIS W. SARGENT
Governor of Massachusetts

DR. LEE G. HENDERSON
Director
Florida Division of Community Junior Colleges

Members

THE HONORABLE GORDON SANDISON
State Senator, Washington

THE HONORABLE W. BRANTLEY HARVEY, JR.
State Representative, South Carolina

DR. LELAND L. MEDSKER
Director
Center for Research and Development in
Higher Education
Berkeley, California

DR. BILL J. PRIEST
Chancellor
Dallas County Junior College District
Texas

DR. M. OLIN COOK
Executive Director
Commission on Coordination of
Higher Educational Finance, Arkansas

MR. JOHN MUCHMORE
Associate Professor of Speech
William Rainey Harper College
Palatine, Illinois

MRS. RHEA M. ECKEL
President
Cazenovia College, New York

MR. EDWARD BOOHER
Chairman
McGraw-Hill Book Company

Resource Consultants

DR. PAUL H. CARNELL
Assistant Director, Division of College Support
U.S. Office of Education

DR. JOHN EMENS
President Emeritus
Ball State University

Section I: Recommended General Policy Statement on Community-Junior Colleges.

1. **NEED FOR COMPREHENSIVE COMMUNITY COLLEGES.** The demands of American so-

ciety on 1970 require that each high school graduate or otherwise qualified person have open access to post-high school education. Essential to such access are systems of comprehensive community colleges which admit all per-

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPIN-
IONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY
REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU-
CATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE 002 240

sons who could reasonably benefit from such admission, and which offer academic, occupational, and general education to give students the widest possible range of options. New community colleges should be established as comprehensive rather than as single purpose institutions, and existing colleges should be encouraged to become truly comprehensive in practice as well as in theory. Open access to comprehensive community colleges will require such colleges to be located within commuting distance of all citizens (except in sparsely populated areas), and to have a tuition and student aid policy that encourages attendance from all economic groups.

2. DEVELOPMENT OF HUMAN POTENTIAL.

The function of the community college is to develop human potential and therefore its emphasis should be on meeting the diverse needs of individuals. To fulfill its purpose the college should emphasize service rather than facilities, should give increasing attention to achievement of the individual rather than to time-defined programs, and should emphasize continuation to completion of objectives rather than measuring success or failure by attrition from traditional programs. Essential to the open-door concept is an effective program of guidance staffed by an adequate number of professionals and supported with the concern and involvement of the entire faculty and community.

3. CAREER EDUCATION. As the community college seeks to serve the needs of individual students, it must recognize that one objective of all education is preparation for an occupation, and therefore it should give more attention to career readiness as a part of all educational programs. Occupational programs should be flexible enough to meet individual needs as perceived by the student, while at the same time providing required entry level occupational skills. For purposes of program planning by colleges and for guidance and career planning by individuals, comprehensive manpower projections by state and by regions within each state are essential.

4. THE NEED FOR COORDINATION. There is a need for more adequate statewide planning and coordination of community and junior colleges, of these colleges as an integral part of the system of higher education, and of these colleges as they relate to all forms and types of post-high school education in the state. A special need at the present time exists in the area of occupational education where parallel systems often exist, offering similar and even identical programs in the same locality. Because each state's higher education system is unique, there is no single model appropriate for all states. However, in each state there should be a coordinating agency with statutory authority for overall coordination of all postsecondary education and for carrying out the function of master planning all types of higher education in the state.

Coordination and planning should recognize the continuing but differing needs and demands of society beyond the high school age, and should therefore neither seek complete uniformity of institutions or instruction nor stifle the incentive and initiative of community colleges and other institutions to provide programs of instruction to meet the needs of individual communities.

State coordination should also include provisions for the articulation of community-junior colleges — both public and private — with secondary schools, particularly in the home districts of the colleges, and with other postsecondary educational institutions to which students might transfer. It is essential that any system make provision for students to move with a minimum of disruption both vertically and horizontally as needed to achieve their educational goals. In order to facilitate such transfer a more comprehensive system of evaluating educational experiences should be developed.

As two-year postsecondary institutions continue to expand, the need for assuring places in senior institutions for students in transfer programs progressively increases, as does the need for more effective program coordination of the two- and four-year institutions.

Effective articulation with secondary schools is necessary to assure that community colleges will, in fact, serve the needs of the community and make available relevant postsecondary education to the variety of young people coming out of secondary schools, especially those who are educationally, socially, or economically disadvantaged.

5. PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTORS. The mutuality of interests and the common goals of private and public two-year colleges should be recognized. The Education Commission of the States affirms its belief that the public weal can be served most fully and effectively only under a policy that acknowledges the complementary roles of the private and the public sectors of higher education, and urges each of its constituent states to commit itself to the full utilization of the resources of private as well as public institutions.

6. FACULTY PREPARATION AND DEVELOPMENT. There is general recognition that the comprehensive nature of the community-junior college and the diversity of students served generate teaching and staff positions that require a new type of advanced education, and that the new type need not necessarily fit the traditional mode of graduate education. Additionally, the unique demands of the community-junior college necessitate a variety of preservice and inservice programs for staff development. To accomplish these ends, the following are recommended:

a. The establishment of new and extension of existing graduate programs which will give attention to both subject matter competency and to the particular demands of teaching in the community college to complement existing research-oriented graduate programs.

b. That all programs for preparation and development of community college faculty members reflect a joint effort on the part of the community-junior college and the university.

c. That such programs implement the best of educational and technological advances.

d. That increased funding be given to intra-institutional and interinstitutional inservice programs for faculty development.

7. **FEDERAL ASSISTANCE.** To promote the continued development of these valuable educational resources, it is recommended that the federal government provide substantial financial assistance to community colleges to supplement state and local support for both current operations and for capital outlay. Any federal legislation for support of higher education or occupational education should specifically recognize the role of community colleges in the total system of postsecondary education. Any federal legislation authorizing support for any aspect of postsecondary education should require state plans which provide for the best method of fulfilling the postsecondary educational needs of the respective states.

8. **CARNEGIE REPORT.** The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education is to be commended for its excellent special report, *The Open Door Colleges*. The recommendations contained in that report constitute a sound and logical basis for developing systems of post-high school education, and that report should be given serious study and consideration by each state.

Section II: Principles for Federal Action Relating to Community-Junior Colleges.

The community college is a relative newcomer on the higher education scene, and during the past ten years has been the most dynamic and rapidly growing segment of higher education in this country. There is ample evidence that neither existing federal legislation nor the administrative branch of the federal government have adequately recognized or supported this development. Community colleges have had little or no representation in the United States Office of Education, and have not received an equitable share of federal funds appropriated for education.

ECS strongly urges that the following principles be adopted by the federal government through appropriate administrative action and in legisla-

tion, either as part of an omnibus higher education bill or as a separate community college act:

1. The legislation should allocate to community colleges an equitable share of federal funds flowing to education.

2. The legislation should require a comprehensive state plan for community colleges that is consistent with the state plan for all postsecondary education. The chairman of the entity developing the state plan for community colleges should be the executive officer of the state agency responsible for community colleges, or a chairman should be appointed by the governor if no such position exists.

3. The legislation should provide for general institutional aid for current operations on the basis of full-time equivalent students, and should provide additional special support for high-cost programs determined to be in the national interest, such as career education, cooperative education, compensatory education, and education in urban centers, for example.

A specified proportion of the appropriations for categorical aid should be retained by the U.S. Commissioner of Education for use in funding regional projects, developmental projects, and other projects not appropriately funded by the several states. Other funds should be allocated to the several states to be used in accordance with the approved state plan.

4. There should be an expanded and strengthened community-junior college unit in the U.S. Office of Education, which can serve the needs of community-junior colleges.

5. Funds should be earmarked for specific faculty and staff training for community-junior colleges.

6. Grants for capital construction and equipment provided under Section 103, Higher Education Facilities Act and under Title VI-A, Higher Education Act of 1965, should be continued.

7. Efficient use of available resources demands optimum coordination at all levels. Therefore, the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should take all necessary steps to assure coordination at the federal level of all programs affecting community colleges, including enforcement of statutes and regulations requiring coordination of programs at the state level.

8. Student aid is especially important for community colleges because of the great

number of community college students from low-income levels. The federal government should continue to provide financial aid for community college students and should carry out the role described in Section 3 of the report of the Task Force on Student Assistance.*

9. Community colleges should be appropriately represented on any federal committees advising on the formulation or implementation of higher education legislation.

Section III: Principles for Action by States Relating to Community-Junior Colleges.

Community college legislation in any state must recognize the historic development of postsecondary and higher education in that state. Therefore, no single type of legislation is appropriate to all states, and perhaps not to any two states. In general, however, every state is encouraged to establish comprehensive community colleges so that to the extent possible such an institution is within commuting distance of all high school graduates. Each state should immediately develop a plan for a community college system if it has none, and if a plan now exists it should be reviewed by the appropriate existing agency or by a body brought into being for the purpose of conducting such a review. The plan as finally adopted or revised should be an integral part of a plan for all postsecondary education in the state, hopefully one developed and monitored by a statewide coordinating agency or an overall governing board responsible for education beyond the high school.

In general, state legislation establishing community colleges, in addition to recognizing the historical development and current status of higher education in the state, should be based on the following principles:

1. Basic to the overall plan should be the guarantee that a place will be reserved in four-year institutions in the state for eligible transfer students as certified by the community colleges.

2. Legislation should establish or identify a state agency with responsibility for approving the establishment of community colleges and for providing statewide coordination, services, leadership, and evaluation of the community college program. This should include such continuing research and development activities as are necessary to assist and coordinate the community colleges.

3. To assure responsiveness to local need and to establish and perpetuate vital local involvement, major responsibility for management and decision making for the community college should be vested in a local board.

4. Legislation should provide assurance of continuing financial support with a minimum financial burden on the student and with a division between state and local support consistent with the general fiscal pattern of the state.

5. To further assure equity and coordination, the state should take such steps as are necessary to assure that the state advisory council on vocational education is an independent, broadly representative committee; that the state plan for vocational education is open, flexible, and recognizes and supports the potential contributions of all postsecondary institutions toward meeting the manpower needs of the state; and that the state agency administering federal vocational funds includes an element specifically responsible for service and support of community colleges.

ANNUAL MEETINGS OF INTEREST

Education Commission of the States:
July 7-9, 1971
Sheraton-Boston Hotel, Boston,
Massachusetts

State Higher Education Executive Officers
Officers Association: July 28-30, 1971
Sun Valley, Idaho

For further information concerning these meetings, contact Higher Education Services, ECS, 300 Lincoln Tower, 1860 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colorado 80203.

* The full report of this task force, titled *Post-Secondary Educational Opportunity: A Federal-State-Institutional Partnership*, is available at the price of \$1.50 from the Education Commission of the States, 300 Lincoln Tower Building, 1860 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colorado 80203. 130 pages.